



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/775,142	02/11/2004	Toshiaki Kuroda	1341.1184	2446
21171 7590 04/13/2009 STAAS & HALSEY LLP SUITE 700 1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20005				
EXAMINER				
REFAI, RAMSEY				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3627				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
04/13/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/775,142

Applicant(s)

KURODA ET AL.

Examiner

Ramsey Refai

Art Unit

3627

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 March 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2 and 4-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2 and 4-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-8508)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

Responsive to Request for Continued Examination (RCE) filed March 17, 2009. Claims 1, 6, 11, and 16-21 were amended. Claim 3 was canceled. Claims 1-2 and 4-26 remain pending.

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Objections

2. Claims 4 and 25-26 are objected to because of the following informalities:

Claim 4 depends on canceled claim 3.

In claims 25-26: *computer program* should be amended to read *computer readable storage medium* as recited the parent claims.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-2 and 4-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Inoue et al (US 6,981,633) in view of "Official Notice".

5. As per claim 1, Inoue et al teach a point of sale terminal device capable of communicating information with an automatic change dispenser capable of accepting and dispensing cash, comprising:

a manual input unit that is enabled to receive from the cashier a manually input amount of rejected cash rejected by the automatic change dispenser (**see at least column 3, lines 35-40, column 6, lines 4-9, column 7, lines 29-37**);

a deposit calculation unit that receives from the automatic change dispenser the amount of accepted cash, and calculates total amount of deposited cash that has been deposited by a customer by adding the amount of accepted cash and the amount of rejected cash (**see at least column 5, line 53-column 6, line 28**); and

a change calculation unit that calculates an amount of change to be paid back to the customer based on the total amount of deposited cash, and instructs the automatic change dispenser to dispense the amount of change (**see at least column 9, line 52-column 10, line 50**).

Inoue et al teach a cashier display and the cashier pressing a key to display the total amount due (**see at least column 9, line 46-column 10, line 10**) but fails to explicitly teach a display unit that displays, in response to a request by a cashier, *an amount of cash accepted by the automatic change dispenser*. However, "Official Notice" is taken that both the concept and advantage of displaying the amount deposited at a money acceptor is well known in the art. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the Applicant's invention to include this feature in Inoue et al because doing so would allow the cashier to determine the amount already deposited in order to properly settle the transaction using money that has been rejected by the change machine.

Furthermore, Inoue et al fail to explicitly teach the manual input step occurs *after the display unit has displayed the amount of accepted cash*. However, the input of the amount already accepted would need to be displayed first in order to determine the remaining balance prior to settling the transaction using the money that was rejected.

6. As per claim 2, Inoue et al fail to explicitly teach *a payment instruction unit that instructs the automatic change dispenser to refund a cash corresponding to the deposit information, when there is request for cancellation of transaction after the automatic change dispenser has accepted the cash*. However, "Official Notice" is taken that the concept and advantage of this feature is well known in the art as evidenced by Marion (US Patent No. 6,073,840). Marion teaches that a customer who opts out of the transaction can request a refund from the cash acceptor which then will eject the customer payment (**column 44, line 64-column 45-29**). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include this feature because doing so would allow for the money accepted by the bill/coin acceptor to be refunded when the customer opts out of the transaction.

The Applicant has not adequately traversed the Official Notice taken in the previous action. " *To adequately traverse such a finding, an applicant must specifically point out the supposed errors in the examiner's action, which would include stating why the noticed fact is not considered to be common knowledge or well-known in the art.*" MPEP 2144.03c. **The common knowledge or well-known in the art statement is taken to be admitted prior art because the traverse was inadequate. MPEP 2144.03c**

7. As per claim 4, Inoue et al teach a cashier display and the cashier pressing a key to display the total amount due (**see at least column 9, line 46-column 10, line 10**) but fails to explicitly teach *a key wherein the display unit displays the deposit information when the key is*

operated. However, "Official Notice" is taken that both the concept and advantage of displaying the amount deposited at a money acceptor is well known in the art. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the Applicant's invention to include this feature in Inoue et al because doing so would allow the cashier to use a key to determine the amount already deposited in order to properly settle the transaction using money that has been rejected by the change machine.

8. As per claim 5, Inoue et al teach a totaling unit that separately calculates a total of the amounts of the accepted cash that has been accepted by the automatic change dispenser over a predetermined period of time (**time of the transaction**) and a total of the amount of rejected cash that have been manually input through the manual input unit over the predetermined time period (**see at least column 9, line 52-column 10, line 50, column 5, line 53-column 6, line 28**).

9. As per claims 6-21, these claims contain similar limitations as claims 1-2, 4-5 above, therefore are rejected under the same rationale.

10. As per claim 22, Inoue et al teach wherein the POS terminal device further comprises: a drawer that stores the rejected cash; and an output unit that outputs: a total amount of cash stored in the automatic cash dispenser and a total amount of cash stored in the drawer at the end of the predetermined period of time, the calculated total of the amounts of accepted cash over the predetermined period of time, the calculated total of the amounts of rejected cash over the predetermined period of time, a calculated total of the amounts of change paid back to customers over the predetermined period of time, and a calculated total amount of cash that is

supposed to be stored in the automatic cash dispenser and the drawer at the end of the predetermined period of time **(see at least column 5, lines 20-52)**.

11. As per claims 24-26, these claims contain similar limitations as claim 23 above and therefore are rejected under the same rationale.

Conclusion

Examiner's Note: The Examiner has cited specific citations in the reference(s) as applied to the claim(s) above for the convenience of the Applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings in the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested that the Applicant, in preparing their response, fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the examiner.

Furthermore, claims directed to an apparatus must be distinguished from the prior art in terms of structure rather than function, *In re Danly*, 263 F.2d 844, 847, 120 USPQ 528, 531 (CCPA 1959). A claim containing a "recitation with respect to the manner in which a claimed apparatus is intended to be employed does not differentiate the claimed apparatus from a prior art apparatus" if the prior art apparatus teaches all the structural limitations of the claim. *Ex parte Masham*, 2 USPQ2d 1647 (Bd Pat. App & Inter. 1987).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ramsey Refai whose telephone number is (571) 272-3975. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30 - 5:00 p.m..

Art Unit: 3627

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ryan Zeender can be reached on (571) 272-6790. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Ramsey Refai
April 11, 2009
/Ramsey Refai/
Examiner, Art Unit 3627